



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/673,144	09/30/2003	Soon-Young Park	041993-5227	3821
9629	7590	12/29/2005	EXAMINER	
MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW WASHINGTON, DC 20004			NGUYEN, DUNG T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2871	

DATE MAILED: 12/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/673,144

Applicant(s)

PARK ET AL.

Examiner

Dung Nguyen

Art Unit

2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 22 and 25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21, 23 and 24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' response dated 10/11/2005 has been received and entered. Claims 1-21, 23 and 24 are remain pending in the application.

Election/Restrictions

Applicants maintain traverse that the requirement was improper since "claims are never species" and not for any "undue burden". This is not found persuasive, as stated in the previous office action, because applicant provides no evidence to support *how they are related to each other and why they are not undue burden*, so as restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

The required is still deemed proper and is therefore made **FINAL**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-18, 20-21 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(e) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Nagata et al., US Patent No. 6,624,857.

The above claims are anticipated by Nagata et al. figure 15 and accompanying text which disclose a liquid crystal display (LCD) device and a method of forming the same comprising:

- . a plurality of data lines (3);
- . a plurality of gate lines (2);

Art Unit: 2871

. a source driver (20a), a source printer circuit board (col. 25, ln. 62);
. a gate driver (20b);
. a plurality of common voltage lines (24/25);
. a first dummy line (22), a second dummy line (21);
. a plurality of static electricity preventing units (26a/26b); wherein at least one of the static electricity preventing unit (46) is directly connected to the gate/source driver (col. 22, lines 6-7).

Even if Nagata et al. do not disclose the static electricity preventing unit being directly connected to the source driver, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to employ a static electricity preventing unit being directly connected to the source driver since “source driver” and “gate driver” can be conventionally used interchangeably for discharging a residual charge in an LCD device.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 6, 13 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagata et al., US Patent No. 6,624,857.

Regarding the above claims, Nagata et al. do not disclose a silver dot in the LCD device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ at least one silver dot in an LCD device as evidence from Applicants' Related Art (see page 2, line 1 and figure 1) in order to supply a common voltage to a common electrode.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 10/11/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants' arguments are as follow:

- a. inspection-use TFTs have nothing to do whatsoever with static electricity prevention.
- b. The inspection-use TFTs are disposed indirectly to the source and gate drivers.
- c. None of the prior art of record teaches that source and gate drivers in an LCD device are somehow interchangeable for discharging anything is common knowledge or well known in the art.

The Examiner's responses are as follow:

- a. Applicants are directed to Nagata et al which disclose the inspection use TFTs including resistive element to avoid the static-electricity breakdown (paragraph bridging col. 5 and 6, col. 21, ln 46-51, col. 38, ln. 41-52).
- b. Nagata et al. do disclose that the static electricity preventing unit (46) is directly connected to the gate/source driver (col. 22, lines 6-7).
- c. Grounding method is used to prevent the static electricity in the circuitry. Therefore, one of skilled in the art would be able to understand the word "interchangeable" between source and gate as grounding to source or gate driver to discharge the static electricity. In other words, it is a common practice in the art discharging the static electricity through the gate and/or source driver(s). See also Ha (US 6,493,0047), figure 5, as evidence to show a prevent element can be directly connected to source driver.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-2297. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert H. Kim can be reached on 571-272-2293. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2871

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DN
12/26/2005



Dung Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2871